arXiv:1210.0371v1 [math.OC] 1 Oct 2012

Weak Necessary and Sufficient Stochastic Maximum Principle via Clarke's Generalized Gradient

Yusong Li*and Harry Zheng†

Abstract

In this paper we prove a weak necessary and sufficient maximum principle for stochastic optimal control problems. Instead of insisting on the maximality condition of the Hamiltonian, we show that 0 belongs to the sum of Clarke's generalized gradient of the Hamiltonian and Clarke's normal cone of the control constraint set at the optimal control. Under a joint concavity condition on the Hamiltonian and a convexity condition on the terminal objective function, the necessary condition becomes sufficient. We give two examples to demonstrate the weak stochastic maximum principle.

Keywords: weak stochastic maximum principle, necessary and sufficient conditions, Clarke's generalized gradient, Clarke's normal cone, measurable selection.

AMS MSC2010: 93E20, 49J52.

1 Introduction

There has been extensive research in the stochastic control theory. Two principal and most commonly used methods in solving stochastic optimal control problems are the dynamic programming principle and the stochastic maximum principle (SMP). The books by Fleming-Rishel [12], Fleming-Soner [13], and Yong-Zhou [23] provide excellent expositions and rigorous treatment of the subject of the dynamic programming principle in the optimal deterministic and stochastic control theory.

Many people have made great contributions in the research of the SMP. Kushner [17, 18] is the first to study the necessary SMP. Haussmann [15], Bensoussan [2] and Bismut [3, 4, 5] extend Kushner's SMP to more general stochastic control problems with control-free diffusion coefficients. Peng [20] applies the second order spike variation technique to derive the necessary SMP to stochastic control problems with controlled diffusion coefficients. Zhou [25] simplifies Peng's proof. Cadenillas-Karatzas [6] extends Peng's SMP to systems with random coefficients and Tang-Li [22] with jump diffusions. Bismut [5] is the first to investigate the sufficient SMP. Zhou [26] proves that Peng's SMP is also sufficient in the presence of certain convexity condition. Framstad-Øksendal-Sulem [14] extends the sufficient SMP to systems with jump diffusion, Donnelly [11] with Markovian regime-switching diffusion and, most recently, Zhang-Elliott-Siu [24] with Markovian regime-switching jump diffusion.

Briefly speaking, the necessary SMP states that any optimal control along with the optimal state trajectory must solve a system of forward-backward stochastic differential equations plus a maximum condition of the optimal control on the Hamiltonian. The necessary condition together with certain concavity conditions on the Hamiltonian give the sufficient

---

*Department of Mathematics, Imperial College, London SW7 2BZ, UK. Email: y.li11@imperial.ac.uk

†Department of Mathematics, Imperial College, London SW7 2BZ, UK. Email: h.zheng@imperial.ac.uk

condition of optimality. The major difficulty of generalizing the classical Pontryagin's maximum principle to a stochastic control problem with controlled diffusion term is that, in some cases, the Hamiltonian is a convex function of the control variable and achieves the minimum at the optimal control (see [23, Example 3.3.1]). One of the major contributions of Peng's SMP is the introduction of the generalized Hamiltonian and the second order adjoint stochastic processes. In those cases where the Hamiltonian is convex, it is the second order term that turns the generalized Hamiltonian to a concave function which achieves the maximum at the optimal control. The generalized Hamiltonian and the second order adjoint equation are introduced to preserve the maximality condition of Pontryagin's maximum principle.

However, the second order terms also pose problems. Firstly, one has to assume that all functions involved are twice continuously differentiable in the state variable in order to use the second order variation, which limits the scope of problems applicable to the theorem. Secondly, one has to solve the associated second order adjoint backward stochastic differential equation (BSDE) with the dimensionality equal to the square of that of its first order counterpart, which makes the problem more difficult to solve, at least numerically. Lastly, one can not get the sufficient condition by enhancing the necessary condition with some joint concavity condition to the generalized Hamiltonian and instead one has to add some joint concavity condition to the Hamiltonian (compare [23, Theorem 3.3.2] and [23, Theorem 3.5.2]), which illustrates that the necessary SMP is not completely compatible with the sufficient SMP. This motivates us to relax the requirement of the maximality of the Hamiltonian at the optimal control and to seek a weak but compatible necessary and sufficient SMP.

The main contribution of this paper is that we prove a weak version of the necessary and sufficient SMP. Instead of insisting on the Hamiltonian to achieve the maximum at the optimal control, which is in general impossible, we relax the necessary condition by only requiring the optimal control to be a stationary point of the Hamiltonian. Specifically, we prove that 0 belongs to the sum of Clarke's generalized gradient of the Hamiltonian and Clarke's normal cone of the control constraint set at the optimal control almost surely almost everywhere. Under the joint concavity condition on the Hamiltonian and the convexity condition on the terminal objective function, the necessary condition becomes the sufficient condition. The advantage of the weak SMP is the following. Firstly, the second order differentiability of the coefficients and the objective functions in the state variable is not required as the weak SMP does not have any second order terms. Secondly, the dimensionality of the BSDE is much reduced as the second order adjoint process is not involved. Lastly, the necessary condition and the sufficient condition are compatible with each other in the sense that the necessary condition provides a stationary point while the sufficient condition confirms its optimality, which is in the same sprit as the necessary and sufficient conditions in the finite dimensional optimization.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the notations, the formulation of the stochastic control problem and the basic assumptions. Section 3 recalls some basic concepts of Clarke's generalized gradient and normal cone which are needed for the main results. Section 4 states the main theorems of the paper and gives two examples to demonstrate the power of the weak SMP. Section 5 establishes some useful preliminary results on moment estimates, Lipschitz property, Taylor expansion and duality analysis. Section 6 proves the main theorems (Theorems 4.1 and 4.2). Section 7 concludes.

2 Problem Formulation

In this section, we formulate the stochastic control problem and introduce some assumptions. We start with a brief summary of the notations that will be used throughout the paper.

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete filtered probability space. Suppose that $\mathcal{F}_0$ contains all the $\mathbb{P}$-null sets in $\mathcal{F}$ and $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ is the right continuous natural filtration generated by $W(t)$, an m-dimensional standard Brownian motion, augmented by all the $\mathbb{P}$-null sets in $\mathcal{F}$. We consider a stochastic control model where the state of the system is governed by a controlled stochastic differential equation

$$\begin{cases} dx(t) & = b(t, x(t), u(t))dt + \sigma(t, x(t), u(t))dW(t), \ t \in [0, T], \\ x(0) & = x_0 \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where u is a $\mathbb{R}^k$ valued progressively measurable (with respect to $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$) process, and $T > 0$ is a fixed finite time horizon, $b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^n$, $\sigma = (\sigma^1, \ldots, \sigma^m) : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^k \to (\mathbb{R}^n)^m$ are given functions satisfying the following assumptions:

(A1) The maps b and σ are measurable, and there exists constants $L > 0$, $K > 0$ such that for $\phi = b$ and σ we have

$$\begin{cases} |\phi(t, x, u) - \phi(t, \hat{x}, \hat{u})| \leq L|x - \hat{x}| + K|u - \hat{u}|, \\ \forall t \in [0, T], \ x, \hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \ u, \hat{u} \in \mathbb{R}^k, \\ |\phi(t, 0, u)| \leq L + K, \ \forall (t, u) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^k. \end{cases}$$

(A2) The maps b and σ are C^1 in x. Moreover, there exist constants $L > 0$ and a modulus of continuity $\bar{\omega} : [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty)$ such that for $\phi = b$ and σ, we have

$$\begin{cases} |\phi_x(t, x, u) - \phi_x(t, \hat{x}, \hat{u})| \leq L|x - \hat{x}| + \bar{\omega}(d(u, \hat{u})), \\ \forall t \in [0, T], \ x, \hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \ u, \hat{u} \in \mathbb{R}^k. \end{cases}$$

Consider the cost functional

$$J(u) = E\left[\int_0^T f(t, x(t), u(t))dt + h(x(T))\right], \tag{2}$$

where $f : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}$, and $h : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ are given functions satisfying the following assumptions:

(A3) The maps f and h are measurable and there exists constants $K_1, K_2 \geq 0$ such that

$$|f(t, x, u) - f(t, x, \hat{u})| \leq (K_1 + K_2(|x| + |u| + |\hat{u}|))\,|u - \hat{u}|.$$

(A4) The maps f and h are C^1 in x. Moreover, there exist constants $L > 0$ and a modulus of continuity $\bar{\omega} : [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty)$ such that for $\phi = f$ and h, we have

$$\begin{cases} |\phi_x(t, x, u) - \phi_x(t, \hat{x}, \hat{u})| \leq L|x - \hat{x}| + \bar{\omega}(d(u, \hat{u})), \\ \forall t \in [0, T], \ x, \hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \ u, \hat{u} \in \mathbb{R}^k \\ |\phi_x(t, 0, u)| \leq L + K, \ \forall (t, u) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^k. \end{cases}$$

Remark 2.1. Assumptions **(A3)** and **(A4)** together cover many cases, including all quadratic functions in x and u. For instance, if f is Lipschitz in u, then $K_2 = 0$. On the other hand, if f is differentiable with respect to u and f_u satisfies a linear growth condition in u, then K_2 is a positive constant.

A control u is called *admissible* if it is a progressively measurable process, valued in U, a nonempty closed convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^k$, such that

$$\|u\| := \left(\int_0^T E|u(t)|^4 dt\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} < \infty. \tag{3}$$

Denote by $\mathcal{U}_{ad}$ the set of all admissible controls. Consider a measure space (S, Σ, μ), where $S = \Omega \times [0, T]$, Σ denotes the predictable σ-field generated by the $\mathcal{F}_t$ adapted Brownian motion and $\mu = \mathbb{P} \times Leb$. Define $L^4(S; \mathbb{R}^k)$ to be the Banach space of $\mathbb{R}^k$ valued Σ measurable functions f such that the norm is defined by (3). Since Σ is a predictable σ-field we have that $f \in L^4(S; \mathbb{R}^k)$ is progressively measurable. Under assumption **(A1)**, for any $u \in L^4(S; \mathbb{R}^k)$, the state equation (1) admits a unique solution, and the cost functional (2) is well defined. In the case that x is a solution of (1) corresponding to an admissible control $u \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}$, we call (x, u) an *admissible pair*, and x an *admissible state process.*

Our optimal control problem can be stated as follows

Problem (S) Minimize (2) over $\mathcal{U}_{ad}$.

Any $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}$ satisfying

$$J(\bar{u}) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}} J(u)$$

is called an *optimal control.* The corresponding $\bar{x}$ and $(\bar{x}, \bar{u})$ are called an *optimal state process* and *optimal pair*, respectively.

3 Clarke's Generalized Gradient and Normal Cone

In this section we recall some basic concepts and properties in nonsmooth analysis and optimization, which are needed in the statement and proof of the main results (Theorems 4.1 and 4.2). Clarke's generalized gradient is first introduced to the finite dimensional space in [7] and then extended to the infinite dimensional space in [8, 9] and [1]. Interested readers may refer to [10] for a detailed and complete treatment of the topic.

Definition 3.1. *(Generalized directional derivative) Let C be an open subset of a Banach space X, and let a function $f : C \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given. We suppose that f is Lipschitz on C. The generalized directional derivative of f at x in the direction v, denoted $f^o(x; v)$, is given by*

$$f^o(x; v) = \limsup_{y \to_C x, \lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{f(y + \lambda v) - f(y)}{\lambda}.$$

Definition 3.2. *(Clarke's generalized gradient) Let X^* denote the dual of X and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be the duality pairing between X and X^*. The generalized gradient of f at x, denoted $\partial f(x)$, is the set of all ζ in X^* satisfying*

$$f^o(x; v) \geq \langle v, \zeta \rangle \text{ for } \forall v \in X.$$

Theorem 3.3. *If f attains a local minimum or maximum at x, then $0 \in \partial f(x)$.*

Theorem 3.3 is only valid in the case where C is open. When the function is defined on a general non-empty subset of X, we need to introduce the so-called distance function and the concept of Clarke's tangent cone and normal cone.

Definition 3.4. *(Distance function) Let X be a Banach space and C be a non-empty subset of X. The distance function $d_C : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined as*

$$d_C(x) = \inf\{\|x - c\| : c \in C\}.$$

Theorem 3.5. *The function d_C satisfies the following global Lipschitz condition on X*

$$|d_C(x) - d_C(y)| \leq \|x - y\|.$$

Definition 3.6. *(Adjacent cone) Let $\bar{C}$ be the closure of C and $x \in \bar{C}$. The adjacent cone to C at x, denoted as $T_C^b(x)$, is defined by*

$$T_C^b(x) := \{v | \lim_{h \to 0^+} d_C(x + hv)/h = 0\}.$$

Definition 3.7. *(Tangent cone) Suppose $x \in C$. A vector v in X is a tangent to C at x provided $d_C^o(x; v) = 0$. The tangent cone to C at x, denoted as $T_C(x)$, is the set of all tangents to C at x.*

In addition, when the set C is convex, it can be proved that the adjacent and tangent cones coincide, see [1, Proposition 4.2.1].

Theorem 3.8. *Assume that C is convex. Then $T_C(x) = T_C^b(x)$.*

Definition 3.9. *(Normal cone) Let $x \in C$. The normal cone to C at x is defined by the polarity with $T_C(x)$:*

$$N_C(x) = \{\xi \in X^* : \langle \xi, v \rangle \leq 0 \text{ for all } v \in T_C(x)\}.$$

The following necessary optimality condition is proved in [10, page 52 Corollary].

Theorem 3.10. *Assume that f is Lipschitz near x and attains a minimum over C at x. Then $0 \in \partial f(x) + N_C(x)$.*

4 Weak Stochastic Maximum Principle

In this section we state the weak necessary and sufficient stochastic maximum principles and give two examples to illustrate the main results.

The Hamiltonian $H : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n\times m} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$, for the stochastic control problem (1) and (2), is defined by

$$H(t, x, u, p, q) = \langle p, b(t, x, u) \rangle + tr[q^T \sigma(t, x, u)] - f(t, x, u). \tag{4}$$

Given an admissible pair (x, u), the *adjoint equation* is the following linear BSDE:

$$\begin{cases} dp(t) & = -\{b_x(t, x(t), u(t))^T p(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sigma_x^j(t, x(t), u(t))^T q^j(t) \\ & \quad - f_x(t, x(t), u(t))\}dt + q(t)dW(t),\ t \in [0, T] \\ p(T) & = -h_x(x(T)). \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

Substitute the Hamiltonian H defined in (4), we have

$$\begin{cases} dp(t) & = -H_x(t, x(t), u(t), p(t), q(t))dt + q(t)dW(t),\ t \in [0, T] \\ p(T) & = -h_x(x(T)). \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

Any pair of stochastic processes $(p, q) \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n) \times (L^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n)^m)$ is called an *adapted solution* of (5), where $q = (q^1, \ldots, q^m)$ and $L^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n)$ is the space of $\mathbb{R}^n$-valued square integrable progressively measurable processes. Existence and uniqueness of the solutions of BSDEs driven by Brownian motions have been extensively studied in [19]. According to their result, we know that under assumptions **(A1)-(A4)**, for any $(x, u) \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{U}_{ad}$, (5) admits a unique adapted solution (p, q). If $(\bar{x}, \bar{u})$ is an optimal (resp. admissible) pair, and $(\bar{p}, \bar{q})$ is the adapted solution of (5), then $(\bar{x}, \bar{u}, \bar{p}, \bar{q})$ is called an *optimal* (resp. *admissible) 4-tuple.*

We can now state the main results of the paper.

Theorem 4.1. *(Weak Necessary SMP) Let assumptions **(A1)-(A4)** hold. Let $(\bar{x}, \bar{u})$ be an optimal pair of **Problem (S)**. Then there exists a pair of stochastic processes $(\bar{p}, \bar{q}) \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0,T;\mathbb{R}^n) \times (L^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0,T;\mathbb{R}^n)^m)$ satisfying the adjoint equation* (5)*, such that*

$$0 \in \partial_u(-H)(t, \bar{x}(t), \bar{u}(t), \bar{p}(t), \bar{q}(t)) + N_U(\bar{u}(t)), \ \text{a.e. } t \in [0,T], \ \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \tag{7}$$

Theorem 4.2. *(Weak Sufficient SMP) Let assumptions **(A1)-(A4)** hold and let $(\bar{x}, \bar{u}, \bar{p}, \bar{q})$ be an admissible 4-tuple satisfying (7). Suppose further that h is convex and $H(t, \cdot, \cdot, \bar{p}(t), \bar{q}(t))$ is concave for all $t \in [0,T]$ a.s. Then $(\bar{x}, \bar{u})$ is an optimal pair for **Problem (S)**.*

We consider two examples from [23] and derive the same results as those in [23] using Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2. A key property to use in our approach is the adaptedness of the adjoint process.

Example 4.3. Consider the following stochastic control problem [23, Example 3.5.3]:

$$\begin{cases} dx(t) = u(t)dW(t), t \in [0,1] \\ x(0) = 0 \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

with the control constraint set $U = [0,1]$ and the cost functional

$$J(u) = E\left\{ -\int_0^1 u(t)dt + \frac{1}{2}x(1)^2 \right\}.$$

Suppose $(\bar{x}, \bar{u})$ is an optimal pair, then the corresponding adjoint equation is

$$\begin{cases} d\bar{p}(t) = \bar{q}(t)dW(t), t \in [0,1] \\ \bar{p}(1) = -\bar{x}(1). \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

Using (8) and (9) and via a simple calculation we obtain

$$\bar{p}(t) = -\int_0^t \bar{u}(s)dW(s) - \int_t^1 (\bar{u}(s) + \bar{q}(s))\, dW(s).$$

Since the adjoint process $\bar{p}(t)$ is adapted to the filtration $\mathcal{F}_t$, we must have

$$\bar{u}(t) + \bar{q}(t) = 0 \ \text{for all } t \in [0,1], \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \tag{10}$$

The corresponding Hamiltonian is

$$H(t, x, u, \bar{p}(t), \bar{q}(t)) = \bar{q}(t)u + u.$$

Since the problem satisfies **(A1)-(A4)**, by Theorem 4.1 and (7), we have

$$0 \in -(\bar{q}(t) + 1) + N_{[0,1]}(\bar{u}(t)) \ \text{for all } t \in [0,1], \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Consequently, on any nonzero measurable set $E \in S = \Omega \times [0,1]$, we can only have the following three cases:

Case 1 : $0 < \bar{u}(t) < 1 \Longrightarrow N_{[0,1]}(\bar{u}(t)) = \{0\}$ *and* $\bar{q}(t) = -1$.

Case 2 : $\bar{u}(t) = 0 \Longrightarrow N_{[0,1]}(\bar{u}(t)) = (-\infty, 0]$ *and* $\bar{q}(t) + 1 \leq 0$.

Case 3 : $\bar{u}(t) = 1 \Longrightarrow N_{[0,1]}(\bar{u}(t)) = [0, +\infty)$ *and* $\bar{q}(t) + 1 \geq 0$.

Suppose Case 1 or Case 2 is true, then $\bar{u}(t) + \bar{q}(t) \leq \bar{u}(t) - 1 < 0$ for some nonzero measurable set $E \in S$, contradiction to (10). Hence, we have $\bar{u}(t) = 1$ for every $t \in [0,1], \mathbb{P}$-a.s. and $\bar{x}(t) = W(t)$ and $(\bar{p}(t), \bar{q(t)}) = (-W(t), -1)$ for $t \in [0,1]$. Since $(x,u) \mapsto H(t,x,u,\bar{p}(t),\bar{q}(t)) = -u + u = 0$ is concave and $x \mapsto h(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^2$ is convex, we conclude that $\bar{u}(t) = 1$ is the optimal control using Theorem 4.2.

Example 4.4. Consider the following stochastic control problem [23, Example 3.3.1]:

$$\begin{cases} dx(t) = u(t)dW(t), t \in [0,1] \\ x(0) = 0 \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

with the control constraint set $U = [-1, 1]$ and the cost functional

$$J(u) = E\left\{ \int_0^1 [x(t)^2 - \frac{1}{2}u(t)^2]dt + x(1)^2 \right\}.$$

Suppose $(\bar{x}, \bar{u})$ is an optimal pair, then the corresponding adjoint equation is

$$\begin{cases} d\bar{p}(t) = 2\bar{x}(t)dt + \bar{q}(t)dW(t), t \in [0,1] \\ \bar{p}(1) = -2\bar{x}(1). \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

Using (11), (12) and via a simple calculation, we obtain

$$\bar{p}(t) = -2\int_0^t (2-t)\bar{u}(s)dW(s) - \int_t^1 ((4-2s)\bar{u}(s) + \bar{q}(s))dW(s).$$

Since the adjoint process $\bar{p}(t)$ is adapted to the filtration $\mathcal{F}_t$, we must have

$$(4-2t)\bar{u}(t) + \bar{q}(t) = 0 \textit{ for all } t \in [0,1], \mathbb{P}\textit{-a.s.} \tag{13}$$

The corresponding Hamiltonian is

$$H(t,x,u,\bar{p}(t),\bar{q}(t)) = \bar{q}(t)u - x^2 + \frac{1}{2}u^2.$$

Since the problem satisfies assumptions **(A1)-(A4)**, by Theorem 4.1 and (7), we have

$$0 \in -(\bar{q}(t) + \bar{u}(t)) + N_{[-1,1]}(\bar{u}(t)) \textit{ for all } t \in [0,1], \mathbb{P}\textit{-a.s.}$$

Consequently, on any nonzero measurable set $E \in S$, we can only have the following three cases:

Case 1 $-1 < \bar{u}(t) < 1 \Longrightarrow N_{[-1,1]}(\bar{u}(t)) = \{0\}$ and $\bar{q}(t) + \bar{u}(t) = 0$.

Case 2 $\bar{u}(t) = -1 \Longrightarrow N_{[-1,1]}(\bar{u}(t)) = (-\infty, 0]$ and $\bar{q}(t) + \bar{u}(t) \leq 0$.

Case 3 $\bar{u}(t) = 1 \Longrightarrow N_{[-1,1]}(\bar{u}(t)) = [0, +\infty)$ and $\bar{q}(t) + \bar{u}(t) \geq 0$.

Suppose Case 2 were true. Then

$$(4-2t)\bar{u}(t) + \bar{q}(t) \leq -3 + 2t \leq -1.$$

Contradiction to (13). Suppose Case 3 were true. Then

$$(4-2t)\bar{u}(t) + \bar{q}(t) \geq 3 - 2t \geq 1.$$

Contradiction to (13). Hence we have

$$-1 < \bar{u}(t) < 1 \textit{ and } \bar{q}(t) + \bar{u}(t) = 0 \textit{ for all } t \in [0,1], \mathbb{P}\text{-}a.s.$$

By (13), (11) and (12), we obtain $(\bar{x}(t), \bar{u}(t)) = (0,0)$ and $(\bar{p}(t), \bar{q}(t)) = (0,0)$. However, since $(x,u) \mapsto H(t,x,u,\bar{p}(t),\bar{q}(t)) = -x^2 + \frac{1}{2}u^2$ is not a concave function, Theorem 4.2 cannot be used. We have to use other method to check the optimality of $\bar{u}$. Substituting $x(t) = \int_0^t u(s)dW(s)$ into the cost functional and via simple calculations, we obtain

$$J(u) = E\int_0^1 \left(\frac{3}{2} - t\right) u(t)^2 dt$$

Hence, we conclude that $\bar{u}(t) = 0$ is indeed the optimal control.

Remark 4.5. Note that our approach in Example 4.4 is different from that in [23, Example 3.3.1] in the following sense. Instead of trying to find the optimal control directly from the objective function, we first find all admissible controls satisfying the necessary condition stated in Theorem 4.1. After that, by using the adaptedness property of the adjoint process, we prove that if an optimal control exists, then it must be $\bar{u}(t) = 0$. Finally, by calculating the cost function explicitly, we verify that our candidate $\bar{u}(t) = 0$ is indeed the optimal control. Note also that the Hamiltonian $u \mapsto H(t,\bar{x}(t),u,\bar{p}(t),\bar{q}(t)) = \frac{1}{2}u^2$ is a convex function and $\bar{u}(t) = 0$ is a minimum point. This is the reason that [23] introduces the generalized Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$ which makes $\bar{u}(t) = 0$ a maximum point.

5 Preliminary Results

In this section, we prove some preliminary results, which will be useful in the sequel. Hereafter, K represents a generic constant.

5.1 A Moment Estimate

The following result is a simplified version of [23, Lemma 3.4.2].

Lemma 5.1. *Let $Y(t) \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0,T;\mathbb{R}^n)$ be the solution of the following:*

$$\begin{cases} dY(t) &= \{A(t)Y(t) + \alpha(t)\}dt + \sum_{j=1}^{m}\{B^j(t)Y(t) + \beta^j(t)\}dW^j(t), \\ Y(0) &= Y_0, \end{cases}$$

where $A, B^j : [0,T] \times \Omega \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ and $\alpha, \beta^j : [0,T] \times \Omega \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ are $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$-adapted, and

$$\begin{cases} |A(t)|, |B^j(t)| \leq L, \ a.e. t \in [0,T], \ \mathbb{P} - a.s., \ 1 \leq j \leq m, \\ \int_0^T E|\alpha(s)|^{2k} \, \mathrm{d}s + \int_0^T E|\beta^j(s)|^{2k} ds < \infty, \ 1 \leq j \leq m, \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

for some $k \geq 1$. Then

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} E|Y(t)|^{2k} \leq K \left\{ E|Y_0|^2 k + \int_0^T E|\alpha(s)|^{2k} ds + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \int E|\beta^j(s)|^{2k} ds \right\}. \tag{15}$$

Proof. For notation simplicity, we prove only the case $m = 1$, leaving the case $m > 1$ to the interested reader. We first assume that α and β are bounded. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and define

$$\langle Y\rangle_\varepsilon \triangleq \sqrt{|Y|^2 + \varepsilon^2}, \ \forall\, Y \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{16}$$

Note that for any $\epsilon > 0$, the map $Y \mapsto \langle Y\rangle_\epsilon$ is smooth and $\langle Y\rangle_\epsilon \to |Y|$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Applying Itô's fomula to $\langle Y(t)\rangle_\epsilon^{2k}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d\langle Y(t)\rangle_\epsilon^{2k} &= 2k\langle Y(t)\rangle_\epsilon^{2k-1}\frac{|Y(t)|}{\langle Y(t)\rangle_\epsilon}\{[A(t)Y(t)+\alpha(t)]\,dt + [B(t)Y(t)+\beta(t)]\,dW(t)\} \\ &\quad + \left[k(2k-1)\langle Y(t)\rangle_\epsilon^{2k-2}\frac{|Y(t)|^2}{\langle Y(t)\rangle_\epsilon^2} + k\langle Y(t)\rangle_\epsilon^{2k-1}\frac{\epsilon^2}{\langle Y(t)\rangle_\epsilon^3}\right][B(t)Y(t)+\beta(t)]^2\,dt. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\langle Y(t)\rangle_\epsilon > |Y(t)|$ and $2k-1 \geq 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d\langle Y(t)\rangle_\epsilon^{2k} &\leq 2k\langle Y(t)\rangle_\epsilon^{2k-1}\{[A(t)Y(t)+\alpha(t)]dt + [B(t)Y(t)+\beta(t)]dW(t)\} \\ &\quad + \left[k(2k-1)\langle Y(t)\rangle_\epsilon^{2k-2}\right][B(t)Y(t)+\beta(t)]^2\,dt. \end{aligned}$$

Writing it in the integral form and taking the expectation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E\langle Y(t)\rangle_\epsilon^{2k} &\leq E\langle Y(0)\rangle_\epsilon^{2k} + 2kE\int_0^t \langle Y(s)\rangle_\epsilon^{2k-1}\{|A(s)|\langle Y(s)\rangle_\epsilon + |\alpha(s)|\}ds \\ &\quad + k(2k-1)E\int_0^t \langle Y(s)\rangle_\epsilon^{2k-2}\{|B(s)|\langle Y(s)\rangle_\epsilon + |\beta(s)|\}^2 ds \\ &\leq E\langle Y(0)\rangle_\epsilon^{2k} + K_0E\int_0^t \Big\{\langle Y(s)\rangle_\epsilon^{2k} + |\alpha(s)|\langle Y(s)\rangle_\epsilon^{2k-1} \\ &\quad + |\beta(s)|^2\langle Y(s)\rangle_\epsilon^{2k-2}\Big\}\,ds, \end{aligned}$$

where K_0 is a constant independent of t. Applying Young's inequality, we get

$$E\langle Y(t)\rangle_\epsilon^{2k} \leq E\langle Y(0)\rangle_\epsilon^{2k} + KE\int_0^t \left\{\langle Y(s)\rangle_\epsilon^{2k} + |\alpha(s)|^{2k} + |\beta(s)|^{2k}\right\}ds.$$

Finally, Gronwall's inequality yields

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} E\langle Y(t)\rangle_\epsilon^{2k} \leq K\left\{E\langle Y(0)\rangle_\epsilon^{2k} + E\int_0^T \left[|\alpha(s)|^{2k} + |\beta(s)|^{2k}\right]ds\right\} \tag{17}$$

for some constant $K = K(L,k,T)$. Letting $\epsilon \to 0$ in (16), then (17) becomes (15). ☐

5.2 Lipschitz Property

Lemma 5.2. *Let $u_1, u_2 \in L^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k)$ and x_1, x_2 be the associated state processes satisfying (1). Then we have the following inequality:*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} E|x_1(t)-x_2(t)|^4 \leq K\|u_1-u_2\|^4$$

Proof. Let $\xi(t) \triangleq x_1(t) - x_2(t)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} d\xi(t) &= [b(t,x_1(t),u_1(t)) - b(t,x_2(t),u_2(t))]\,dt \\ &\quad + [\sigma(t,x_1(t),u_1(t)) - \sigma(t,x_2(t),u_2(t))]\,dW(t), \\ &= \left[\tilde{b}_x(t)\xi(t) + b(t,x_2(t),u_1(t)) - b(t,x_2(t),u_2(t))\right]dt \\ &\quad + [\tilde{\sigma}_x(t)\xi(t) + \sigma(t,x_2(t),u_1(t)) - \sigma(t,x_2(t),u_2(t))]\,dW(t), \end{aligned}$$

where for $\phi = b$ and σ,

$$\tilde{\phi}_x(t) \triangleq \int_0^1 \phi_x\left(t, x_2(t) + \theta(x_1(t) - x_2(t)), u_1(t)\right) d\theta.$$

By Lemma 5.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{t\in[0,T]} E|\xi(t)|^4 \leq & K\left\{\int_0^T E|b(s, x_2(s), u_1(s)) - b(s, x_2(s), u_2(s))|^4 ds\right.\\ & \left. + \int_0^T E|\sigma(s, x_2(s), u_1(s)) - \sigma(s, x_2(s), u_2(s))|^4 ds\right\}\\ \leq & \tilde{K}\left\{\int_0^T E\left[K^4|u_1(s) - u_2(s)|^4\right] ds\right.\\ \leq & K\|u_1 - u_2\|^4.\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.3. *Assume that* ***(A1)*** *holds. Given control* $u \in L^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k)$ *and associated state process* x *satisfying* (1), *then*

$$E\left(\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}|x(t)|^2\right) \leq K\left(1 + |x_0|^2 + \int_0^T E|u(t)|^2 dt\right) \tag{18}$$

Proof. For every integer $k \geq 0$, define the stopping time

$$\tau_k = T \wedge \inf\{t \in [0,T] : |x(t)| \geq k\}.$$

Clearly, $\tau_k \uparrow T$ a.s. Set $x_k(t) = x(t\wedge\tau_k)$ and $u_k(t) = u(t\wedge\tau_k)$ for $t \in [0,T]$. Then $x_k(t), u_k(t)$ satisfy the equation

$$x_k(t) = x_0 + \int_0^t b(s, x_k(s), u_k(s))I_{[0,\tau_k]}(s)ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, x_k(s), u_k(s))I_{[0,\tau_k]}(s)dW(s).$$

Using the elementary inequality $|a + b + c| \leq 3(|a|^2 + |b|^2 + |c|^2)$, Hölder's inequality and **(A1)**, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|x_k(t)|^2 \leq & K|x_0|^2 + Kt\int_0^t \left(1 + |x_k(s)|^2 + |u_k(s)|^2\right) ds\\ & + K\left|\int_0^t \sigma(s, x_k(s), u_k(s))I_{[0,\tau_k]}(s)dW(s)\right|^2.\end{aligned}$$

By Doob's martingale inequality (see [16]) and **(A1)**, we have

$$\begin{aligned}E\left(\sup_{0\leq s\leq t}|x_k(s)|^2\right) \leq & K|x_0|^2 + KT\int_0^t (1 + E|x_k(s)|^2 + E|u_k(s)|^2)ds\\ & + 4KE\int_0^t |\sigma(s, x_k(s), u_k(s))|^2 I_{[0,\tau_k]}(s)ds\\ \leq & K\left\{1 + |x_0|^2 + \int_0^t E|u_k(s)|^2 + E|x_k(s)|^2 ds\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Gronwall's inequality yields that

$$E\left(\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}|x_k(t)|^2\right) \leq K\left(1 + |x_0|^2 + \int_0^T E|u_k(t)|^2 dt\right).$$

Finally, the required inequality (18) follows by letting $k \to \infty$. □

Lemma 5.4. *The cost functional* $J : L^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k) \to \mathbb{R}$ *is locally Lipschitz, i.e., for all* $\hat{u}$ *in* $L^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k)$ *there exists a small ball* $B_{\hat{u}}^M$ *with radius* $M > 0$ *containing* $\hat{u}$ *on which , we have*

$$|J(u_1) - J(u_2)| \le K_{M,\hat{u}}\|u_1 - u_2\| \tag{19}$$

for $\forall u_1, u_2 \in B_{\hat{u}}^M$.

Proof. Given $\hat{u} \in L^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k)$ and $M > 0$, define

$$B_{\hat{u}}^M \triangleq \Big\{u \in L^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k) : \|u - \hat{u}\| < M\Big\}.$$

For any $u_1, u_2 \in B_{\hat{u}}^M$ with associated state process x_1, x_2, according to **(A4)** we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&E|h(x_1(T)) - h(x_2(T))| \\
&\le E\int_0^1 |\langle h_x(x_1(T) + \theta(x_2(T) - x_1(T))), x_2(T) - x_1(T)\rangle| d\theta \\
&\le K\left\{E\left(1 + |x_1(T)|^2 + |x_2(T)|^2\right)\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}\left\{E|x_2(T) - x_1(T)|^2\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\le K\left\{E\left(1 + |\hat{x}(T)|^2 + |\hat{x}(T) - x_1(T)|^2 + |\hat{x}(T) - x_2(T)|^2\right)\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}\left\{E|x_2(T) - x_1(T)|^2\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}
\end{aligned}$$

by Hölder's inequality and Minkowski's inequality. According to Lemma 5.3, Jensen's inequality and Lemma 5.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
E|h(x_1(T)) - h(x_2(T))| &\le K_M\left\{1 + \left(\int_0^T E|\hat{u}(t)|^2 dt\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\}\left\{E|x_2(T) - x_1(T)|^2\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\le K_M\left\{1 + \left(\int_0^T E|\hat{u}(t)|^4 dt\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}\right\}\left\{E|x_2(T) - x_1(T)|^4\right\}^{\frac{1}{4}} \\
&\le K_{M,\hat{u}}\|u_1 - u_2\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\int_0^T |f(t, x_1(t), u_1(t)) - f(t, x_2(t), u_2(t))| dt \\
&\le E\int_0^T |f(t, x_1(t), u_1(t)) - f(t, x_2(t), u_1(t))| + |f(t, x_2(t), u_1(t)) - f(t, x_2(t), u_2(t))| dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Following similar arguments, we have

$$E\int_0^T |f(t, x_1(t), u_1(t)) - f(t, x_2(t), u_1(t))| dt \le K_{M,\hat{u}}\|u_1 - u_2\|.$$

For the second term, by **(A3)** we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\int_0^T |f(t, x_2(t), u_1(t)) - f(t, x_2(t), u_2(t))| dt \\
&\le E\int_0^T \{K_1 + K_2(|x_2(t)| + |u_1(t)| + |u_2(t)|)\}|u_1(t) - u_2(t)| dt \\
&\le K\left\{E\int_0^T \left(1 + |x_2(t)|^2 + |u_1(t)|^2 + |u_2(t)|^2\right) dt\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|u_1 - u_2\| \\
&\le K_M\left(1 + \left\{E\int_0^T |\hat{u}(t)|^4\right\}^{\frac{1}{4}}\right)\|u_1 - u_2\| \\
&\le K_{M,\hat{u}}\|u_1 - u_2\|.
\end{aligned}$$

(19) follows by combining the above inequalities. ☐

5.3 Taylor Expansions

Let (x,u) be an admissible pair. Let $v \in \mathrm{L}^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k)$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Define $u^\epsilon(t) \triangleq u(t) + \epsilon v(t)$ for all $t \in [0,T]$. Let (x^ϵ, u^ϵ) satisfy the following stochastic control system:

$$\begin{cases} dx^\epsilon(t) & = b(t, x^\epsilon(t), u^\epsilon(t))dt + \sigma(t, x^\epsilon(t), u^\epsilon(t))dW(t),\ t \in [0,T], \\ x^\epsilon(0) & = x_0. \end{cases}$$

Next, for $\varphi = b,\ \sigma^j,\ (1 \le j \le m),\ f$, we define

$$\varphi_x(t) \triangleq \varphi_x(t, x(t), u(t)), \quad \delta\varphi(t) \triangleq \varphi(t, x(t), u^\epsilon(t)) - \varphi(t, x(t), u(t)).$$

Let y^ϵ be the solution of the following stochastic differential equation:

$$\begin{cases} dy^\epsilon(t) & = \{b_x(t) y^\epsilon(t) + \delta b(t)\}\, dt + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left\{\sigma_x^j(t) y^\epsilon(t) + \delta\sigma^j(t)\right\} dW^j(t),\ t \in [0,T], \\ y^\epsilon(0) & = 0 \end{cases} \tag{20}$$

Remark 5.5. The variation in our proof is different from the so-called spike variation technique in the proof of Peng's maximum principle in [20] and [23]. In their proof, where $u^\epsilon(t) = u(t) + 1_{[\tau,\tau+\epsilon]} v(t)$, one first perturbs an optimal control on a small set of size ϵ and then let $\epsilon \to 0$. Whereas, in our proof we perturbs an optimal control over the whole space. Then reason behind this is that in the definition of Clarke's generalized directional derivative, $v(t)$ represents a directional vector in $L^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k)$ and must be fixed. One perturbs the control through multiplication of a scalar ϵ and letting $\epsilon \to 0$.

The following lemma gives the Taylor expansion result of the state process and cost functional.

Lemma 5.6. *Let assumptions **(A1)-(A4)** hold. Then, we have*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} E\left|x^\epsilon(t) - x(t)\right|^2 = O(\epsilon^2), \tag{21}$$

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} E\left|y^\epsilon(t)\right|^2 = O(\epsilon^2), \tag{22}$$

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} E\left|x^\epsilon(t) - x(t) - y^\epsilon(t)\right|^2 = o(\epsilon^2). \tag{23}$$

Moreover, the following expansion holds for the cost functional:

$$\begin{aligned} J(u^\epsilon) = \ & J(u) + E\langle h_x(x(T)), y^\epsilon(t)\rangle \\ & + E\int_0^T \{\langle f_x(t, x(t), u(t)), y^\epsilon(t)\rangle + \delta f(t)\}\, dt + o(\epsilon). \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Proof. For simplicity, we carry out the proof only for the case $n = m = 1$.

Proof of (21). Let $\xi^\epsilon(t) \triangleq x^\epsilon(t) - x(t)$. The we have

$$\begin{cases} d\xi^\epsilon(t) & = \left\{\tilde{b}_x^\epsilon(t)\xi^\epsilon(t) + \delta b(t)\right\} dt \\ & \quad + \{\tilde{\sigma}_x^\epsilon(t)\xi^\epsilon(t) + \delta\sigma(t)\}\, dW(t),\ t \in [0,T], \\ \xi(0) & = 0. \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

where for $\phi = b$ and σ,

$$\tilde{\phi}_x^\epsilon(t) \triangleq \int_0^1 \phi_x(t, x(t) + \theta(x^\epsilon(t) - x(t)), u^\epsilon(t))d\theta. \tag{26}$$

By Lemma 5.1, since $\tilde{b}_x^\epsilon(t)$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_x^\epsilon(t)$ are bounded according to assumption **(A1)**, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{t\in[0,T]} E|\xi^\epsilon(t)|^2 &\le K\int_0^T E\left\{|\delta b(s)|^2+|\delta\sigma(s)|^2\right\}ds\\ &\le K\epsilon^2\int_0^T E|v(s)|^2 ds\\ &\le K\epsilon^2.\end{aligned}$$

This proves (21).

Proof of (22). Similarly, $b_x(t)$ and $\sigma_x(t)$ are bounded according to assumption **(A1)**. Applying Lemma 5.1 to (20), we obtain

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} E|y^\epsilon(t)|^2 \le K\int_0^T E\left\{|\delta b(s)|^2+|\delta\sigma(s)|^2\right\}ds \le K\epsilon^2.$$

This proves (22).

Proof of (23). Let $\zeta^\epsilon(t)\triangleq x^\epsilon(t)-x(t)-y^\epsilon(t)\equiv\xi^\epsilon(t)-y^\epsilon(t)$. Then, by (25) and (20) we have

$$\begin{aligned}d\zeta^\epsilon(t)=&d\xi^\epsilon(t)-dy^\epsilon(t)\\ =&\left\{\tilde{b}_x^\epsilon(t)\xi^\epsilon(t)-b_x(t)y^\epsilon(t)\right\}dt+\left\{\tilde{\sigma}_x^\epsilon(t)\xi^\epsilon(t)-\sigma_x(t)y^\epsilon(t)\right\}dW(t)\\ =&\left\{\tilde{b}_x^\epsilon(t)\zeta^\epsilon(t)+\left[\tilde{b}_x^\epsilon(t)-b_x(t)\right]y^\epsilon(t)\right\}dt\\ &+\left\{\tilde{\sigma}_x^\epsilon(t)\zeta^\epsilon(t)+\left[\tilde{\sigma}_x^\epsilon(t)-\sigma_x(t)\right]y^\epsilon(t)\right\}dW(t)\end{aligned}$$

Since $\tilde{b}_x^\epsilon(t)$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_x^\epsilon(t)$ are bounded by assumption **(A1)**, applying Lemma 5.1 we obtain

$$\sup\nolimits_{t\in[0,T]} E|\zeta^\epsilon(t)|^2 \le \quad K\int_0^T E\left\{\left|\left[\tilde{b}_x^\epsilon(t)-b_x(t)\right]y^\epsilon(t)\right|^2+\left|\left[\tilde{\sigma}_x^\epsilon(t)-\sigma_x(t)\right]y^\epsilon(t)\right|^2\right\}dt. \tag{27}$$

By Hölder's inequality, (26), (22) and (21), also note that for any $\rho>0$, there exists a constant $K_\rho>0$ such that $\bar{\omega}(r)\le\rho+rK_\rho$ for all $r\ge0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T E\left|\left[\tilde{b}_x^\epsilon(t)-b_x(t)\right]y^\epsilon(t)\right|^2dt\\ \le&\int_0^T\left(E\left|\tilde{b}_x^\epsilon(t)-b_x(t)\right|^4\right)^{\frac12}\left(E\left|y^\epsilon(t)\right|^4\right)^{\frac12}dt\\ \le&\int_0^T\left\{E\int_0^1\left|b_x\left(t,x(t)+\theta\xi^\epsilon(t),u^\epsilon(t)\right)-b_x(t)\right|^4d\theta\right\}^{\frac12}\epsilon^2dt\\ \le&K\int_0^T\left\{E\left(\xi^\epsilon(t)^4+\bar{\omega}(\epsilon v(t))^4\right)\right\}^{\frac12}\epsilon^2dt\\ \le&K\int_0^T\left\{\epsilon^4+E[\rho+K_\rho\epsilon|v(t)|]^4\right\}^{\frac12}\epsilon^2dt\\ \le&K\left\{\epsilon^2+\rho^2+K_\rho^2\epsilon^2\int_0^T\left\{E|v(t)|^4\right\}^{\frac12}dt\right\}\epsilon^2.\end{aligned}$$

Hence the first term in (27) is $o(\epsilon^2)$, the second term can be shown similarly being $o(\epsilon^2)$, which gives (23).

Proof of (24). By definition of the cost functional (2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & J(u^\epsilon) - J(u) \\ =& E\left\{h(x^\epsilon(T)) - h(x(T))\right\} + E\int_0^T \left\{f(t, x^\epsilon(t), u^\epsilon(t)) - f(t, x(t), u(t))\right\} dt \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

For the first term on the right side of (28) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & E\left\{h(x^\epsilon(T)) - h(x(T))\right\} \\ &= E\int_0^1 \langle h_x(x(T) + \theta\xi^\epsilon(T)), \xi^\epsilon(T)\rangle d\theta \\ &= E\langle h_x(x(T)), y^\epsilon(T)\rangle + E\langle h_x(x(T)), \zeta^\epsilon(T)\rangle \\ &+ E\int_0^1 \langle h_x(x(T) + \theta\xi^\epsilon(T)) - h_x(x(T)), \xi^\epsilon(T)\rangle d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by (21), (23), **(A4)** and applying Hölder's inequality, we have

$$E\left\{h(x^\epsilon(T)) - h(x(T))\right\} = E\langle h_x(x(T)), y^\epsilon(T)\rangle + o(\epsilon). \tag{29}$$

For the second term on the right side of (28) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & E\int_0^T \left\{f(t, x^\epsilon(t), u^\epsilon(t)) - f(t, x(t), u(t))\right\} dt \\ =& E\int_0^T \left\{\int_0^1 \langle f_x(t, x(t) + \theta\xi^\epsilon(t), u^\epsilon(t)), \xi^\epsilon(t)\rangle d\theta\right\} \\ & + \left\{f(t, x(t), u^\epsilon(t)) - f(t, x(t), u(t))\right\} dt \\ =& E\int_0^T \left\{\langle f_x(t, x(t), u(t)), y^\epsilon(t)\rangle + \delta f(t)\right\} \\ & + \left\{\int_0^1 \langle f_x(t, x(t) + \theta\xi^\epsilon(t), u^\epsilon(t)) - f_x(t, x(t), u(t)), y^\epsilon(t)\rangle d\theta\right\} \\ & + \left\{\int_0^1 \langle f_x(t, x(t) + \theta\xi^\epsilon(t), u^\epsilon(t)), \zeta^\epsilon(t)\rangle d\theta\right\} dt \end{aligned}$$

Then, using **(A4)** and by a similar argument as in the proof of (23), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & E\int_0^T \left\{f(t, x^\epsilon(t), u^\epsilon(t)) - f(t, x(t), u(t))\right\} dt \\ &= E\int_0^T \left\{\langle f_x(t, x(t), u(t)), y^\epsilon(t)\rangle + \delta f(t)\right\} + o(\epsilon). \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

(24) follows from (29) and (30). □

5.4 Duality Analysis

Lemma 5.7. *Let assumptions **(A1)-(A4)** hold. Let y^ϵ be the solution of* (20) *and* (p, q) *be the adapted solution of* (5). *Then*

$$E\langle p(T), y^\epsilon(T)\rangle = E\int_0^T \left\{\langle p(t), \delta b(t)\rangle + \langle f_x(t), y^\epsilon(t)\rangle + tr\left[q(t)^T\delta\sigma(t)\right]\right\} dt \tag{31}$$

Proof. Applying Itô's lemma we get

$$\begin{aligned} d\langle p(t), y^\epsilon(t)\rangle = &\Bigg\{ \langle p(t), b_x(t)y^\epsilon(t) + \delta b(t)\rangle + \left\langle q(t), \sum_{j=1}^m \left[\sigma_x^j(t)y^\epsilon(t) + \delta\sigma^j(t)\right] \right\rangle \\ &+ \left\langle - \left[b_x(t)^T p(t) + \sum_{j=1}^m \sigma_x^j(t)^T q^j(t) - f_x(t) \right], y^\epsilon(t) \right\rangle \Bigg\} dt \\ &+ \left\{ \left\langle p(t), \sum_{j=1}^m [\sigma_x^j(t)y^\epsilon(t) + \delta\sigma^j(t)] \right\rangle + \langle q(t), y^\epsilon(t)\rangle \right\} dW(t). \end{aligned}$$

Writing it in integral form and taking the expectation we have

$$E\langle p(T), y^\epsilon(T)\rangle = E\int_0^T \left\{ \langle p(t), \delta b(t)\rangle + \langle f_x(t), y^\epsilon(t)\rangle + \langle q(t), \sum_{j=1}^m \delta\sigma^j(t)\rangle \right\} dt,$$

which proves (31). □

Now we are able to give the following lemma, which is of great importance.

Lemma 5.8. *Let assumptions* ***(A1)-(A4)*** *hold. For any* $\varepsilon > 0$ *and* $v \in L^4(S; \mathbb{R}^k)$*, define*

$$u^\epsilon(t) \triangleq u(t) + \epsilon v(t) \text{ for } \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Then we have

$$J(u^\epsilon) - J(u) = E\int_0^T (-H(t, x(t), u^\epsilon(t), p(t), q(t))) - (-H(t, x(t), u(t), p(t), q(t)))dt + o(\epsilon)$$

Proof. According to Lemma 5.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J(u^\epsilon) - J(u) =& E\langle h_x(x(T)), y^\epsilon(T)\rangle + E\int_0^T \{\langle f_x(t, x(t), u(t)), y^\epsilon(t)\rangle + \delta f(t)\} dt + o(\epsilon) \\ =& E\langle -p(T), y^\epsilon(T)\rangle + E\int_0^T \{\langle f_x(t, x(t), u(t)), y^\epsilon(t)\rangle + \delta f(t)\} dt + o(\epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Applying (31), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &J(u^\epsilon) - J(u) \\ &= -E\int_0^T \left\{ \langle p(t), \delta b(t)\rangle + tr[q(t)^T \delta\sigma(t)] - \delta f(t) \right\} dt + o(\epsilon) \\ &= E\int_0^T (-H(t, x(t), u^\epsilon(t), p(t), q(t))) - (-H(t, x(t), u(t), p(t), q(t)))dt + o(\epsilon) \end{aligned}$$

□

6 Proof of the Main Theorems

6.1 Proof of Theorem 4.1

We follow the technique developed in [8]. Given an optimal 4-tuple $(\bar{x}, \bar{u}, \bar{p}, \bar{q})$, define a functional $\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}} : L^4(S; \mathbb{R}^k) \to \mathbb{R}$ as following

$$\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}}(u) = E\int_0^T -H(t, \bar{x}(t), u(t), \bar{p}(t), \bar{q}(t))dt.$$

By a similar argument as in Lemma 5.4, it can be proved that the functional $\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}}$ is also locally Lipschitz on $L^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k)$. Next, we define Clarke's generalized gradient of the functionals J and $\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}}$ at $\bar{u}$ and explore their properties.

Definition 6.1. *Let $L^{\frac{4}{3}}(S;\mathbb{R}^k)$ denote the dual space of $L^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k)$ and $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ denote the duality pairing between $L^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k)$ and $L^{\frac{4}{3}}(S;\mathbb{R}^k)$. Given an admissible control $\bar{u}\in L^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k)$, Clarke's generalized gradient of J at $\bar{u}$, denoted by $\partial J(\bar{u})$, is the set of all $\zeta\in L^{\frac{4}{3}}(S;\mathbb{R}^k)$ satisfying*

$$J^o(\bar{u};v)=\limsup_{u\to\bar{u},\epsilon\to 0}\frac{J(u+\epsilon v)-J(u)}{\epsilon}\geq\langle v,\zeta\rangle, \tag{32}$$

for all $v\in L^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k)$. Clarke's generalized gradient of $\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}}$ at $\bar{u}$ is defined similarly.

Then, according to Lemma 5.8, given $u\in L^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k)$, for any $\epsilon>0$ and $v\in L^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k)$ such that $u+\epsilon v\in L^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k)$, we have

$$J(u+\epsilon v)-J(u)=\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}}(u+\epsilon v)-\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}}(u)+o(\epsilon).$$

Hence, we have

$$J^o(\bar{u};v)=(\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}})^o(\bar{u};v),\ \textit{for}\ \forall v\in L^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k).$$

Therefore, by Definition 6.1, we conclude

$$\partial J(\bar{u})=\partial\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}}(\bar{u}).$$

Since $\bar{u}$ is an optimal control on $\mathcal{U}_{ad}$, according to Theorem 3.10,

$$0\in\partial J(\bar{u})+N_{\mathcal{U}_{ad}}(\bar{u})=\partial\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}}(\bar{u})+N_{\mathcal{U}_{ad}}(\bar{u}). \tag{33}$$

To characterize Clarke's tangent cone in the $L^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k)$ space, we recall [1, Theorem 8.5.1]. Let (Ω,S,μ) be a complete σ-finite measure space and X be a separable Banach space. Consider a measurable set-valued map $K:\Omega\rightsquigarrow X$. We associate with it the subset $\mathcal{K}\subset L^p(\Omega;X,\mu)$ of selections defined by

$$\mathcal{K}:=\{x\in L^p(\Omega;X,\mu)|\ \textit{for almost all}\ \omega\in\Omega,x(\omega)\in K(\omega)\}.$$

Theorem 6.2. *Assume that the set-valued map K is measurable and has closed images. Then for every $x\in\mathcal{K}$, the set valued map $\omega\to T^b_{K(\omega)}(x(\omega))$ is measurable. Furthermore*

$$\{v\in L^p(\Omega;X,\mu)|\ \textit{for almost all}\ \omega,v(\omega)\in T^b_{K(\omega)}(x(\omega))\}\subset T^b_{\mathcal{K}}(x).$$

Returning to our proof, since U is convex, by definition, $\mathcal{U}_{ad}$ is also a convex subset of $L^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k)$. Therefore, by Theorem 3.8 and Theorem 6.2, we obtain

$$T_{\mathcal{U}_{ad}}(\bar{u})\supset\{v\in L^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k)|v(\omega,t)\in T_U(\bar{u}(\omega,t))\ \mu\textit{-almost surely}\}. \tag{34}$$

The optimality condition (33) together with (34) implies that $\exists\zeta\in L^{\frac{4}{3}}(S;\mathbb{R}^k)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} E\displaystyle\int_0^T\langle\zeta(t),v(t)\rangle dt\leq 0\ \textit{for}\ \forall v\in L^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k)\ \textit{such that}\\ v(t)\in T_U(\bar{u}(t))\ \ \textit{for every}\ t\in[0,T],\mathbb{P}\textit{-almost surely}\\ (\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}})^o(\bar{u};v)+E\displaystyle\int_0^T\langle\zeta(t),v(t)\rangle dt\geq 0\ \textit{for}\ \forall v\in L^4(S;\mathbb{R}^k). \end{cases} \tag{35}$$

Now, we recall a version of the measurable selection theorem in [1].

Definition 6.3. *[1, Definition 8.1.2] Let* $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$ *be a measurable space and* X *be a complete separable metric space. Consider a set-valued map* $F : \Omega \rightsquigarrow X$*. A measurable map* $f : \Omega \mapsto X$ *satisfying*

$$\forall \omega \in \Omega, f(\omega) \in F(\omega)$$

is called a measurable selection of F*.*

Theorem 6.4. *[1, Theorem 8.1.3] Let* X *be a complete separable metric space,* $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$ *a measurable space,* F *a measurable set-valued map from* Ω *to closed nonempty subsets of* X*. Then there exists a measurable selection of* F*.*

Return to our problem. Fix $u \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}$ and $(\omega, t) \in S$. Let $\mathbb{Q}_+$ denote the set of all strictly positive rationals. Following the argument in [1, Page 325] , we have

$$T_U(u(\omega,t)) = T_U^b(u(\omega,t)) = \bigcap_{n>0} cl \left(\bigcup_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Q}_+} \bigcap_{h\in[0,\alpha]\cap\mathbb{Q}_+} \frac{U - u(\omega,t)}{h} + \frac{1}{n}B \right),$$

where B denotes the unit ball centred at 0. By [1, Theorem 8.2.4], we conclude that the set-valued function $T_U(\bar{u})$ is measurable.

For the first inequality in (35), let $M > 0$ and define $\bar{B}_M \triangleq \{v \in \mathbb{R}^k : \|v\| \leq M\}$. For any positive integer n, define a set-valued function Θ_n^M as follows

$$\Pi_n^M(\omega,t) = \begin{cases} \{0\}, & \textit{if } \langle \zeta(\omega,t), v\rangle < \frac{1}{n},\ \forall v \in \bar{B}_M \cap T_U(\bar{u}(\omega,t)) \\ \{v \in \bar{B}_M \cap T_U(\bar{u}(\omega,t)) : \langle \zeta(\omega,t), v\rangle \geq \frac{1}{n}\}, & \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The map $(\omega, t, v) \to \langle \zeta(\omega,t), v\rangle$ is continuous in v. Moreover, since $\mathbb{R}^k$ is separable, the map can be expressed as the upper limit of a countable family of measurable functions and therefore is measurable. Therefore Π_n^M is measurable since countable intersection of measurable set-valued functions is still measurable. Hence, by Theorem 6.4, Π_n^M admits a measurable selection $v_n^M \in L^4(S; \mathbb{R}^k)$. Note that (35) implies that the set

$$\{(\omega,t) : \Pi_n^M(\omega,t) \neq \{0\}\}$$

must have μ measure 0. Hence, we conclude that there exists a set, denoted as S_n^M, where

$$S_n^M = \{(\omega,t) : \Pi_n^M(\omega,t) = \{0\}\}$$

and $\mu(S_n^M) = 1$. Consequently, we have

$$\langle \zeta(\omega,t), v\rangle < \frac{1}{n} \quad \forall v \in \bar{B}_M \cap T_U(\bar{u}(\omega,t)) \ \textit{on } S_n^M. \tag{36}$$

Define $S^M = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} S_n^M$ with $\mu(S^M) = 1$ since $\mu(S_n^M) = 1$ $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, since (36) holds for all n, we have

$$\langle \zeta(\omega,t), v\rangle \leq 0 \ \forall v \in \bar{B}_M \cap T_U(\bar{u}(\omega,t)) \ \textit{on } S^M. \tag{37}$$

Since (37) holds for arbitrary M, we obtain that

$$\langle \zeta(\omega,t), v\rangle \leq 0 \ \textit{for } \forall v \in T_U(\bar{u}(\omega,t)) \ \mu\textit{-almost surely.} \tag{38}$$

Next, we consider the second inequality in (35). Define the partial generalized directional derivative of the Hamiltonian H at $\bar{u}(t)$ in the direction $v(t)$ as

$$-H_u^o(\bar{u}(t);v(t)) = \limsup_{u\to\bar{u},\epsilon\to 0} \frac{-H(t,\bar{x}(t),u(t)+\epsilon v(t),\bar{p}(t),\bar{q}(t)) + H(t,\bar{x}(t),u(t),\bar{p}(t),\bar{q}(t))}{\epsilon}.$$

Using Fatou's Lemma on the second inequality in (35), we have

$$E\left\{\int_0^T -H_u^o(\bar{u}(t);v(t)) + \langle\zeta(t),v(t)\rangle dt\right\} \geq (\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}})^o(\bar{u};v) + E\int_0^T \langle\zeta(t),v(t)\rangle dt \geq 0 \qquad (39)$$

Let $M>0$ and define $\bar{B}_M \triangleq \{v\in\mathbb{R}^k : \|v\|\leq M\}$. For any $n\in\mathbb{N}$, define a set-valued function Γ_n^M as follows

$$\Gamma_n^M(\omega,t) = \begin{cases} \{0\}, \quad \textit{if } -H_u^o(\bar{u}(\omega,t);v) + \langle\zeta(\omega,t),v\rangle > -\dfrac{1}{n}\ \forall v\in\bar{B}_M \\ \{v\in\bar{B}_M : -H_u^o(\bar{u}(\omega,t);v) + \langle\zeta(\omega,t),v\rangle \leq -\dfrac{1}{n}\}, \ \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Using a similar argument as above, with the help of Theorem 6.4 and (39), we can show that the set $\{(\omega,t):\Gamma_n^M(\omega,t)\neq\{0\}\}$ must have μ measure 0, which implies that

$$-H_u^o(\bar{u}(\omega,t);v)) + \langle\zeta(\omega,t),v\rangle \geq 0 \ \mu\textit{-almost surely.} \qquad (40)$$

Combining (38) and (40), we conclude

$$0\in\partial_u(-H)(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{u}(t),p(t),q(t)) + N_U(\bar{u}(t)), \ \textit{a.e.} t\in[0,T], \ \mathbb{P}\textit{-a.s.}$$

6.2 Proof of Theorem 4.2

Given admissible pair (x,u), define

$$H(t,x(t),u(t)) \triangleq H(t,x(t),u(t),\bar{p}(t),\bar{q}(t)) \ \textit{for} \ \forall t\in[0,T], \ \mathbb{P}\textit{-a.s.}$$

Under the convexity condition, Clarke's generalized gradient and normal cone coincide with the subdifferential and normal cone in the sense of convex analysis. Moreover, combining (7) and the concavity of $H(t,\bar{x}(t),\cdot)$ for all $t\in[0,T]$ a.s, we conclude that

$$H(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{u}(t)) = \max_{u\in U} H(t,\bar{x}(t),u), \ \textit{a.e.} \ t\in[0,T], \ \mathbb{P}\textit{-a.s.}$$

Define $\xi(t)\triangleq x(t)-\bar{x}(t)$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} d\xi(t) &= \{b(t,x(t),u(t)) - b(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{u}(t))\}\,dt \\ &\quad + \displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^m \left\{\sigma^j(t,x(t),u(t)) - \sigma^j(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{u}(t))\right\} dW^j(t), \ t\in[0,T], \\ \xi(0) &= 0. \end{cases}$$

Following a standard separating hyperplane argument in convex analysis (see [21, Chapter 5]), we obtain

$$\int_0^T \{H(t,x(t),u(t)) - H(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{u}(t))\} \leq \int_0^T \langle H_x(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{u}(t)),\xi(t)\rangle dt \qquad (41)$$

for any admissible pair (x,u). Detailed proof of (41) can be found in [14].

Applying Itô's formula to $\langle \bar{p}(t), \xi(t) \rangle$, noting the convexity of h, the inequality (41) and the definition of the Hamilitonian (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& E\{h(x(T)) - h(\bar{x}(T))\} \\
\geq & E\langle h_x(\bar{x}(T)), \xi(T)\rangle \\
= & -E\langle \bar{p}(T), \xi(T)\rangle \\
= & E\int_0^T \{\langle H_x(t, \bar{x}(t), \bar{u}(t)), \xi(t)\rangle - \langle \bar{p}(t), b(t, x(t), u(t)) - b(t, \bar{x}(t), \bar{u}(t))\rangle \\
& - \sum_{j=1}^m \langle \bar{q}_j(t), \sigma^j(t, x(t), u(t)) - \sigma^j(t, \bar{x}(t), \bar{u}(t))\rangle\} dt \\
\geq & -E\int_0^T \{f(t, x(t), u(t)) - f(t, \bar{x}(t), \bar{u}(t))\} dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $J(\bar{u}) \leq J(u)$ for all $u \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}$.

7 Conclusion

We have proved a weak version of the necessary and sufficient stochastic maximum principle. Instead of insisting on the maximality condition of the Hamiltonian, we showed that 0 belongs to the sum of Clarke's generalized gradient of H and Clarke's normal cone at the optimal control $\bar{u}$. Under certain concavity conditions on the Hamiltonian and objective functions, the necessary condition becomes sufficient. The theorem does not involve any second order terms, hence no second order differentiability of the coefficients and objective functions is required. Moreover, the absence of second order adjoint equation considerably simplifies the theorem. Future research on this topic includes the extension of the theorem to more general stochastic control systems such as nonconvex control constraints and local Lipschitz coefficients. We are currently working on these problems.

Acknowledgment. The authors are grateful to Professor Nicole El Karoui for the useful discussions on the paper, especially on the contents of the measurability of stochastic processes.

References

[1] J-P. Aubin and H. Frankowska. *Set-Valued Analysis.* Birkhäuser, 1990.

[2] A. Bensoussan. Lectures on stochastic control. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, 972:1–62, 1981.

[3] J. M. Bismut. Conjugate convex functions in optimal stochastic control. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 44:384–404, 1973.

[4] J. M. Bismut. Linear quadratic optimal control with random coefficients. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 14:419–444, 1976.

[5] J. M. Bismut. An introductory approach to duality in optimal stochastic control. *SIAM Review*, 20:62–78, 1978.

[6] A. Cadenillas and I. Karatzas. The stochastic maximum principle for linear convex optimal control with random coefficients. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 33:590–624, 1995.

[7] F. H. Clarke. Generalized gradients and applications. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc*, 205, 1975.

[8] F. H. Clarke. Shadow prices and duality for a class of optimal control problems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 17, 1979.

[9] F. H. Clarke. Generalized gradients of lipschitz functionals. *Advances in Mathematics*, 40:52–67, 1981.

[10] F. H. Clarke. *Optimization and Nonsmooth Analysis.* SIAM, 1990.

[11] C. Donnelly. Sufficient stochastic maximum principle in the regime-switching diffusion model. *Applied Mathematics and Optimization*, 62(2):155–169, 2011.

[12] W. H. Fleming and R. W. Rishel. *Deterministic and Stochastic Optimal Control.* Springer-Verlag, 1975.

[13] W. H. Fleming and H. M. Soner. *Controlled Markov Processes and Viscosity Solutions.* Springer-Verlag, 2006.

[14] N. C. Framstad, B. Oksendal, and A. Sulem. Sufficient stochastic maximum principle for the optimal control of jump difussions and applications to finance. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 121(1):77–98, 2004.

[15] U. G. Haussmann. *A Stochastic Maximum Principle for Optimal Control of Diffusions.* Longman Scientific and Technical, 1986.

[16] I. Karatzas and S. E. Shreve. *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus.* Springer, 1991.

[17] H. J. Kushner. On the stochastic maximum principle: Fixed time of control. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 11:78–92, 1965.

[18] H. J. Kushner. Necessary conditons for continuous parameter stochastic optimization problems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 10:550–565, 1972.

[19] E. Pardoux and S.Peng. Adapted solution of a backward stochastic differential equation. *Systems and Control Letter*, 14:15–61, 1990.

[20] S. Peng. A general stochastic maximum principle for optimal control problems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 28:966–979, 1990.

[21] R. T. Rockafeller. *Convex Analysis.* Princeton University Press, 1970.

[22] S. Tang and X. Li. Necessary conditions for optimality control of stochastic systems with random jumps. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 32:1447–1475, 1994.

[23] J. Yong and X.Y. Zhou. *Stochastic Controls: Hamiltonian Systems and HJB Equations.* Springer, 1999.

[24] X. Zhang, R. J. Elliott, and T. K. Siu. A stochastic maximum principle for a markov regime-siwching jump-diffusion model and its application to finance. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 50:964–990, 2012.

[25] X. Y. Zhou. A unified treatment of maximum principle and dynamic programming in stochastic controls. *Stochastic and Stochastic Reports*, 36:137–161, 1991.

[26] X. Y. Zhou. Sufficient conditions of optimality for stochastic systems with controllable diffusions. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, AC-41:1176–1179, 1996.